REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in the present application.

Reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

The claims are believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth herein. Notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Huizinga et al.(USP 4,328,280).

Huizinga et al. is cited as teaching a means for measuring an electrical property of at least two samples. Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of Huizanga et al. do not anticipate claim 1 and therefore do not anticipate claim 2 by dependence.

Claim 1 specifically recites that the at least two samples are present at the same time based on the recitation:

> "provided on at least one surface thereof with at least two samples in at least one predefined region"

In contrast, Huizinga et al. teaches the use of a Keithley resistivity adaptor identified as MK Stati-Tester Model 169 which is only capable of testing one sample at a time.

Therefore, multiple samples are not on the same surface for testing. The rejection is therefore improper and withdrawal is respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Huizinga et al. is improper due to the failure of the Huizinga et al. to teach every element of the claimed invention. Withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-9 and 13-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abramsohn et al. (USP 6,166,550) in view of Huizinga et al(USP 4,328,280).

Abramsohn et al. is cited as disclosing an apparatus for evaluating triboelectric properties of a sample. The Office concludes, correctly, that Abramsohn et al. lacks teachings related to evaluation of two samples wherein one sample is a test sample and the other is a reference sample. Huizinga et al. is cited as providing those teachings otherwise lacking in Abramsohn et al.

Both Abramsohn et al. and Huizinga et al. teach a single test element which is tested independently. Whether one element

is a test sample or a live sample is not relavent. The measurement is essentially the same. The cited art has a deficiency in that the measurement of control and live sample are independent events requiring reinserting a new sample and reinitiating the test. The present invention eliminates this deficiency by having at least two samples in at least one predefined region. This limitation is included in each claim by dependence from claim 1. The advantage offered by the present invention is an improved quality of the measurement as set forth in the specification.

The rejection of claims 1-9 and 13-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abramsohn et al. in view of Huizinga et al. is improper and traversed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10-12 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abramsohn et al. in view of Vanmaele et al. (EP 1243409).

Abramsohn et al. is cited as disclosing a method for evaluating triboelectric properties of a sample. Abramsohn et al. is incorrectly cited as comprising "a support provided on at

least one surface thereof with at least two samples each in at least one predefined region". The Office cites col. 13 line 11-20 for such teaching. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no teaching of multiple samples. The Office even states, in contradiction to the statement of teachings, that Fig. 1 shows a sheet supported by a drum wherein "sheet" is the singular term. The Office admits that the teachings are for a single test sample which is contrary to the argument that the teachings include multiple samples.

The Office further opines that Abramsohn et al. lacks "an array of samples" which further contradicts the presence of teaching "at least two samples" as used to form the basis of the rejection.

Vanmaele et al. is cited as teaching those elements otherwise lacking from Abramsohn et al. The combination still fails to render the claims obvious.

Abramsohn et al. teaches removing undesirable residual tribolectric charge with a charging device rather than using the charging device to reproducibly charge an array of samples. Therefore, even if one did combine the teachings of Abramsohn et

al. and Vanmaele et al. the combination would still not lead one of skill in the art to the invention of claims 10-12 and 28.

The rejection of claims 10-12 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abramsohn et al. in view of Vanmaele et al. is improper and traversed.

CONCLUSIONS

All claims are in now believed to be in condition for allowance. Notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

June 3, 2005

Joseph T. Guy, Ph.D.
Agent for Applicants
Registration Number 35,172
Customer No.: 46591